circumstances of each case. The terms of assignment of lands [a] for plantation purposes in the Nilgiri Upper Plateau are given in the appendix to this answer for ready reference.

(e), (f), (g) & (h) The particulars asked for are not available in any existing return or report nor in regard to some items could it be compiled without considerable preliminary enquiry. Whether a piece of land which is now reserve forest may be disforested and assigned is a question to be considered on the merits in each case and may often be a question difficult to answer.

Rao Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar:—"May I know, with reference to (a), if these applications for assignment of lands have been received only from people resident in the Nilgiris or from non-resident people also?"

The hon. Sir Norman Marjoribanks:—"I could not really say that. I must ask for notice of that."

Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar:—"With reference to clauses (e), (f), (g) and (h), it is stated there 'nor in regard to some items could it be compiled without considerable preliminary enquiry.' What are those items, may I know?"

The hon. Sir Norman Marjoribanks:—"Take for example clause (e) which wants the value of the lands possessed by each one of the estate-owners. Obviously, Government could not estimate the values without considerable enquiry. Then again, clause (f) wants 'the extent of land available for assignment to individuals or associations and the localities in which the same is situated.' That will need an enquiry to see whether there is any bit of land which could be disafforested and made available for assignment. The giving of a complete answer to the whole question will therefore require a preliminary enquiry of considerable magnitude."

Assignment of the tank-bed of the Owk tank in Koilkuntla taluk.

* 352 Q.—Mr. G. Harisarvottama Rao: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether within the tank-bed of the Owk tank in the Koilkuntla taluk of the Kurnool district there is included a large area of land which was originally cultivated by the ryots but was relinquished by them in hard times;

(b) if so, what the area of such lands is;

(c) whether within that area there are not about 65 wells which once were privately owned by the forefathers of the present ryot population and used for agricultural purposes;

(d) whether there are still some small plots privately owned inside this tank poramboke area;

(e) whether the ryots have petitioned for grant of parts of this poramboke land on patta; and

(f) why the Government have declined to convert parts of this land into ayan and grant them on patta?

[a] Printed as Appendix I on page 110 infra.

8th October 1928]

A.—(*a*) *to* (*d*) The Government are not aware whether or no the facts are as suggested.

(*e*) & (*f*) No record has been traced of any order of the Government on the subject; nor of any representation made to Government. The transfer of poramboke land to ayan for assignment on darkhast is ordinarily within the discretion of the Collector.

Alleged disabilities of the Catholics in Mangalore in acquiring darkhast lands.

*353 *Q.*—Mr. J. A. Saldanha: With reference to questions Nos. 1740 and 1741 answered on 14th March 1928, will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether Government have received any further representation from anybody in South Kanara or elsewhere as to the disabilities of the Catholic diocese of Mangalore or the Bishop of Mangalore or the Catholic churches in the diocese in acquiring Government lands by way of darkhast or kumki;

(*b*) whether lands are held in *inam* by the following churches in South Kanara:—

(1) Cathedral-Rozario, Mangalore, (2) Milagres, Mangalore, (3) Holy Trinity at Mermazal or Umzur, (4) Infant-Jesus (Mondunkul), (5) Saviour (Agrar, Mangalore taluk), (6) Mater Dei or Mother of God (Mogarnad), (7) Lady of Mercy (Ullal), (8) Remedies (Kirm) in Mangalore taluk, (9) Rosario (Coondapoor taluk), (10) Milagres (Killianpur, Udipi taluk) and (11) Holy Cross (Hospet, Karkal taluk), and if so, under what circumstances and orders; and

(*c*) whether any of these churches have been refused applications for the grant of lands by way of darkhast or kumki on the ground that they are alien or foreign bodies?

A.—(*a*) A representation from the hon. Member was received in May last. The point was also mentioned by the Administrator Apostolic of the Diocese of Mangalore in two appeals relating to assignment of land in Beltangadi village, South Kanara district.

(*b*) Under the Bednore or Ikkri Princes, only the Church at Coondapoor had been enjoying the assessment on the lands in its possession. The other churches had no inams. On the rebuilding of the churches which had been destroyed prior to the British regime the Government on the recommendation of Mr. Harris sanctioned the remission of the assessment on the lands newly purchased by the Christian inhabitants for the churches.

(*c*) The Government have no reason to think that applications have been rejected on the ground alleged. The rules only lay down that the previous sanction of the Government is required to the assignment of land to persons who are not British subjects nor subjects of Indian States.

Mr. J. A. Saldanha:—"With reference to clause (*c*), it is stated: 'The Government have no reason to think that applications have been rejected on the ground alleged.' May I enquire, Sir, whether the applications